UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

,)	CASE NO.				
)					
Plaintiff(s),)	JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO				
)					
VS.)					
,)					
Defendent/e))					
Defendant(s).)	REPORT OF PARTIES' PLANNING MEETING UNDER FED. R. CIV.				
)	P. 26(f) AND L.R. 16.3(b)				
1. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. F	P. 26(f) and	L.R. 16.3(b), a meeting was held on				
, 20, and	was attend	ed by:				
c	ounsel for p	olaintiff(s)				
C	ounsel for p	laintiff(s)				
C	ounsel for d	lefendant(s)				
		lefendant(s)				
2. The parties:						
·	vro diocovor	y displacures required by Pulo26(a)(1) and				
	ne-aiscover	y disclosures required by Rule26(a)(1) and				
the Court's prior order;						
will exchange such di	sclosures by	y, 20;				
have not been required to make initial disclosures.						
3. The parties recommend the following track:						

		-	otion date: atus Hearing/S				
	-		otion date:				
			r amending the		dings and/	or adding	
		ery cut-off date					
` '			ıe date:				
			late:				
(b) Non-Expert discovery cut-off date:							
(a) Descr	ibe the su		e and extent of				
		Discovery Pla		_			
			8 U.S.C. § 636(c).			
-			not consent to	-	ırisdiction	of the Unite	
Ca	ase is no	t suitable for A	ADR at any tim	e.			
Ca	ase is no	t suitable for A	ADR at this time	e but ı	may be aft	er discovery	
Ea	rly Neutr	al Evaluation	Mediation	า	_ Arbitratio	on.	
Resolutio	n (ADR) ı	mechanisms:					
5. This ca	. This case is suitable for one or more of the following Alternative Dispu						
a SHOV	ving of go	ood cause.					

Case: 1:13-cv-01165-CA	AB Doc #: 10-1 Filed: 07/30/13 3 of 3. PageID #: 281
	Attorney for Plaintiff(s)
	Attorney for Plaintiff(s)
	Attorney for Defendant(s)
	Attorney for Defendant(s)